

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

7				
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,254	06/29/2001	Joseph L. Hellerstein	YOR920010334US1	9174
	7590 10/31/2007 N & I FWIS I I P	EXAMINER		
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP 90 Forest Avenue			NGUYEN, NGA B	
Locust Valley,	NY 11560		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3692	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/21/2007	DADED

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/896,254	HELLERSTEIN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Nga B. Nguyen	3692		

· ·	Nga b. Nguyen	3032	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.   The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, at otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date	<u> </u>		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	ng date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing days.	of the fee. The appropri ginally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	,		
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NCow);	OTE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		•	,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ w vided below or appended.	ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence is	necessary and
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fai See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attach	ied.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	at does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. 🗆 Other:  MgaNguyen  NGA NGUYEN			
PRIMARY EXAMINER			
THIMADT EXAMINER			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to the applicant's arguments that Chaar (US Patent 6,857,020) fails to disclose "an agent module located in a distributed element and operative to measure the operation of that distributed element in terms of business metrics based on the electronic contract and then to execute a control command on the distributed element based on a financial optimization, the financial optimization based at least in part on the measured business metrics", examiner disagrees. Examiner submits that Chaar discloses in column 5, line 45 through column 6, line 65, SLA manager comprises one Cross-SLA Event Manager (CSEM), one SLA Management Object (SMO), every SMO determines and executes service management actions, the actions can be performed by one or more service management agents. Thus, SMO is an agent module located in SLA manager (a distributed element) measures the operation of that distributed element in terms of business metrics based on the electronic contract. Moreover, the CSEM handles resource allocation requests submitted by SMO and optimizes the allocation of available computing and people resources based upon the provider's SLA management objectives for all of the established SLA contracts. Therefore, Chaar does disclose "an agent module located in a distributed element and operative to measure the operation of that distributed element in terms of business metrics based on the electronic contract and then to execute a control command on the distributed element based on a financial optimization, the financial optimization based at least in part on the measured business metrics."